

All the provisions of this Section 194, including the several sub-sections thereof, shall apply both to the operator of a motor vehicle and to the owner or person in control thereof who causes or permits such motor vehicle to be equipped or operated contrary to any such provisions.

Negative evidence that horn not blown. See notes to sec. 235. *Sudbrook v. State*, 153 Md. 200.

The light requirements as to motor vehicles no longer relate to the setting and rising of the sun, arbitrarily, but to the actual conditions of light and weather. 162 Md. 272.

Where bus driver turned bus on highway at night with none of its lights visible to persons on the road, and failed to give warning to approaching automobile, question whether his negligence was proximate cause of resulting accident was for jury even though driver of approaching automobile was also guilty of negligence in driving too fast. *Lashley v. Dawson*, 162 Md. 560.

The presumption contended for by appellants that lamp on rear of a tank wagon was lit in accordance with paragraph (3) of this section, when opposed by positive evidence of chauffeur that it was not lighted is without probative force and should not be submitted to jury. *Balto. Transit Co. v. Swindell*, 132 Md. 279.

No negligence held to be imputed to chauffeur under sec. 150 of the An. Code of 1912 (vol. 3). Chauffeur testified that he did not see plaintiff until she was within a few inches of machine. Chauffeur need not sound horn every time he passes around other vehicles standing in street, as the wagon in question was; at all events it cannot be said that omission to sound horn caused accident. *Sullivan v. Smith*, 123 Md. 554.

Failure of plaintiff to comply with sec. 149 of An. Code of 1912 (vol. 2) as to lights, referred to in deciding that he could not recover for injuries to his automobile due to collision. *Gittings v. Schenuit*, 122 Md. 285.

Evidence as to absence from automobile of lights required by sec. 149 of the An. Code of 1912 (vol. 2), held sufficient to take case to jury. *Stewart Taxi-Service Co. v. Roy*, 127 Md. 75.

As to lights on vehicles standing on highways, see art. 27, sec. 627.

Cited in *Miles v. State*, 174 Md. 298.

### **Shatter-Proof Glass.**

1935, ch. 323. 1937, ch. 68.

**195.** (1) It shall be unlawful after June first, nineteen hundred thirty-seven, to operate on any highway in this State a motor vehicle manufactured or assembled after said date, designed or used for the purpose of carrying passengers for hire or as a school bus, unless such vehicle be equipped with safety glass wherever glass is used in said motor vehicle in doors, windows, windshields and wings.

(2) It shall be unlawful after June first, nineteen hundred thirty-seven, to operate on any highway in this State any motor vehicle manufactured or assembled after said date and registered in this State, unless such vehicle be equipped with safety glass wherever glass is used in said motor vehicle in doors, windows, windshields and wings.

(3) It shall be unlawful after June first, nineteen hundred thirty-seven, to sell any motor vehicle manufactured or assembled after said date, registered or intended to be registered in this State and operated or intended to be operated on any highway in this State, unless such vehicle be equipped with safety glass wherever glass is used in said motor vehicle in doors, windows, windshields and wings, and every sale in violation of this provision shall constitute a separate offense.

(4) It shall be unlawful after June first, nineteen hundred thirty-seven, for the owner of any motor vehicle to have broken glass in the windshields thereof replaced with any glass other than safety glass, it shall be unlawful after said date for the owner of any motor vehicle to have safety glass, broken or otherwise, in doors, windows or wings of said motor vehicle replaced with any glass other than safety glass and it shall be unlawful after said date for any person to install in the doors, windows, windshields